

The Honorable Tiffany M. Cartwright

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA**

MOZZY CLARK,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS; LT. DENNIS SIMONS;  
SGT. CARRIE ANN WILLIAMS A/K/A  
CARRIE ANN GUAJARDO; HEIDI  
WHITTEMORE; OFFICER THERESA  
AYOTTE; OFFICER GREGORY BROOKS; and  
DOES 1-10.

Defendants.

NO. 3:24-CV-06058-TMC

ANSWER TO [CORRECTED]  
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT  
FOR DAMAGES BY DEFENDANTS  
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,  
LT. DENNIS SIMONS, SGT. CARRIE  
ANN WILLIAMS, AND HEIDI  
WHITTEMORE

JURY DEMAND

Defendants State of Washington, Department of Corrections, Lt. Dennis Simons, Sgt. Carrie Ann Williams, and Heidi Whittemore (“Answering Defendants”), in Answer to Plaintiff Mozzy Clark’s [Corrected] Second Amended Complaint for Damages, admit, deny, and allege as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 1.
2. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 2.
3. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 3.

ANSWER TO [CORRECTED] SECOND  
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
DAMAGES BY DEFENDANTS STATE,  
SIMONS, WILLIAMS, AND  
WHITTEMORE – NO. 3:24-CV-06058-  
TMC – Page 1

SIMMONS SWEENEY FREIMUND SMITH TARDIF PLLC  
OLYMPIA OFFICE  
711 CAPITOL WAY S, STE 602  
OLYMPIA, WA 98501  
TEL: (360) 534-9960  
FAX: (360) 534-9959  
BELLINGHAM OFFICE  
1223 COMMERCIAL ST  
BELLINGHAM, WA 98225  
TEL: (360) 752-2000  
FAX: (360) 656-5013

EMAIL: john@ssslawgroup.com

4. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 4.

5. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 5, and therefore deny the same.

6. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 6.

7. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 7.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8. Answering Defendants admit the Court has subject matter jurisdiction. Answering Defendants deny the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 8.

9. Answering Defendants admit venue is proper in this judicial district. Answering Defendants deny the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 9.

### **PARTIES**

10. Answering Defendants admit Plaintiff was previously a prisoner housed at the Washington Corrections Center for Women (“WCCW”), which is located in Pierce County, Washington and that she has since been released from custody. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 10, and therefore deny the same.

11. Answering Defendants admit that the Washington State Department of Corrections is an agency of the State of Washington. The remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 11 constitutes legal argument rather than an averment of fact, and therefore requires no answer. To the extent that the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 11 requires an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

12. Answering Defendants admit Dennis Simons is a Lieutenant at WCCW. The remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 12 constitute legal argument rather than an averment of fact, and therefore no answer is required. To the extent an answer to the remainder of the

1 allegations in Paragraph 12 is required, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

3 13. Answering Defendants admit Heidi Whittemore is currently a Correctional Unit  
4 Supervisor (“CUS”). The remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 13 constitute legal argument  
5 rather than an averment of fact, and therefore no answer is required. To the extent an answer to  
6 the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 13 is required, Answering Defendants lack  
7 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and  
8 therefore deny the same.

9 14. Answering Defendants admit Defendant Williams was previously a Sergeant at  
10 WCCW. The remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 14 constitute legal argument rather than  
11 an averment of fact, and therefore no answer is required. To the extent an answer to the remainder  
12 of the allegations in Paragraph 14 is required, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or  
13 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the  
14 same.

15 15. Answering Defendants admit Theresa Ayotte is a corrections officer at WCCW.  
16 Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 15, and therefore deny the same.

18 16. Answering Defendants admit Gregory Brooks is a corrections officer at WCCW.  
19 Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 16, and therefore deny the same.

21 17. The allegations in Paragraph 17 constitute legal argument rather than averments  
22 of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 17 require  
23 an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
24 the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

25 18. The allegations in Paragraph 18 constitute legal argument rather than averments

1 of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 18 require  
 2 an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
 3 the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

4 19. The allegations in Paragraph 19 constitute legal argument rather than averments  
 5 of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 19 require  
 6 an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
 7 the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

8 20. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
 9 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 20, and therefore deny the same.

10 21. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 21.

11 22. The allegations in Paragraph 22 constitute legal argument rather than averments  
 12 of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 22 require  
 13 an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
 14 the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

15 23. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
 16 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 23, and therefore deny the same.

17 24. The allegations in Paragraph 24 constitute legal argument rather than averments  
 18 of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 24 require  
 19 an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
 20 the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

### 21 FACTS

22 25. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
 23 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 25, and therefore deny the same.

24 26. Answering Defendants admit that for a period of time Plaintiff was housed with  
 25 another inmate at WCCW who is a biological male, but who identifies as having female gender.

1 Answering Defendants deny the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 26.

2 27. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 27.

3 28. Answering Defendants admit that inmate Williams had previously been convicted  
4 of sex offenses and had been incarcerated in men's correctional facilities prior to being housed at  
5 WCCW. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
6 the truth of the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 28, and therefore deny the same.

7 29. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 29.

8 30. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 30.

9 31. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
10 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 31, and therefore deny the same.

11 32. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
12 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 32, and therefore deny the same.

13 33. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
14 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 33, and therefore deny the same.

15 34. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
16 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 34, and therefore deny the same.

17 35. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
18 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 35, and therefore deny the same.

19 36. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 36.

20 37. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 37.

21 38. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
22 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 38, and therefore deny the same.

23 39. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
24 as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 39, and therefore deny the same.

25 40. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief

as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 40, and therefore deny the same

41. Answering Defendants admit that a bag containing sex toys was confiscated from Inmate Williams. Answering Defendants deny the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 41.

42. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 42, and therefore deny the same

43. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 43, and therefore deny the same.

44. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 44.

45. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 45, and therefore deny the same.

46. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 46, and therefore deny the same.

47. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 47, and therefore deny the same.

48. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 48.

49. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 49, and therefore deny the same.

50. Answering Defendants admit Plaintiff filed a Prison Rape Elimination Act (“PREA”) complaint against Inmate Williams on February 20, 2022.

51. Answering Defendants admit Inmate Williams was removed from Plaintiff’s cell following her PREA complaint. Answering Defendants deny that it was weeks later before this occurred.

52. Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 52, and therefore deny the same.

53. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 53.

54. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 54.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—FIRST/EIGHTH/FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENTS – *State-Created Danger* – 42 U.S.C. Section 1983  
(Against all Defendants)**

55. Answering Paragraph 55, Answering Defendants reassert their responses to the referenced paragraphs above.

56. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 56.

57. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 57.

58. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 58.

59. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 59.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS— FIRST/EIGHTH/FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENTS – *Deliberate Indifference* – 42 U.S.C. Section 1983  
(Against all Defendants)**

60. Answering Paragraph 60, Answering Defendants reassert their responses to the referenced paragraphs above.

61. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 61.

62. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 62.

63. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 63.

64. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 64.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—FIRST/EIGHTH/FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENTS – *Conspiracy* – 42 U.S.C. Section 1983  
(Against all Defendants)**

65. Answering Paragraph 65, Answering Defendants reassert their responses to the referenced paragraphs above.



66. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 66.

67. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 67.

68. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 68.

69. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 69.

70. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 70.

71. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 71.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT – *Right to Bodily Privacy* – 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 (Against all Defendants)**

72. Answering Paragraph 72, Answering Defendants reassert their responses to the referenced paragraphs above.

73. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 73.

74. The allegations in Paragraph 74 constitute legal argument rather than any averment of fact, and therefore require no answer. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 74 require an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

75. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 75.

76. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 76.

77. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 77.

78. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 78.

79. Answering Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 79.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

The Paragraph labeled, “DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL,” contains only a request for relief rather than any averment of fact, and therefore requires no answer. To the extent any allegations in this Paragraph require an answer, Answering Defendants lack knowledge or information



sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations, and therefore deny the same.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

The Paragraph labeled, “PRAYER FOR RELIEF,” is a request for relief rather than any averment of fact, and therefore requires no answer. To the extent any allegations in this Paragraph require an answer, Answering Defendants deny Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief requested.

Answering Defendants further deny each and every other allegation contained in Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint for Damages that is not explicitly admitted in this Answer.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

By way of FURTHER ANSWER and AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Answering Defendants allege as follows:

1. Plaintiff fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted.
2. Defendant State of Washington Department of Corrections and its agents, officials, and employees in their official capacities are not subject to civil suits for damages in federal court pursuant to immunity conferred under the Eleventh Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
3. All claims alleged under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against individual State employee defendants herein are barred by the doctrine of qualified immunity.
4. Plaintiff’s claims are barred by the doctrines of res judicata and/or collateral estoppel.
5. Plaintiff’s claims are barred by the prohibition on claim splitting, because Plaintiff has asserted claims against the same Defendants in a separate lawsuit in Pierce County Superior Court based on the same alleged occurrences and for the same alleged injuries.
6. Because a parallel action is pending in state court, this Court should abstain from adjudicating this matter pursuant to *Colorado River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States*, 424 U.S. 800, 818-19, 96 S.Ct. 1236, 47 L.Ed 483 (1976).

1           7.       If Plaintiff suffered any damages, recovery therefore is barred by Plaintiff's failure  
2 to mitigate said damages.

3           8.       Defendant State of Washington Department of Corrections is entitled to an offset  
4 from any awards to Plaintiff herein for the costs of any related treatment it provided.

5                   **ANSWERING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

6           WHEREFORE, Answering Defendants pray that Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint  
7 for Damages be dismissed with prejudice, that Plaintiff take nothing by her Second Amended  
8 Complaint for Damages, and that Answering Defendants be allowed their costs and reasonable  
9 attorneys' fees herein.

10                   **ANSWERING DEFENDANTS' JURY DEMAND**

11           In the event this case proceeds to trial, Answering Defendants demand that this case be  
12 tried to a jury.

13           DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2025.

14                               SIMMONS SWEENEY FREIMUND  
15                               SMITH TARDIF, PLLC

16                               /s/ John R. Nicholson  
17                               JOHN R. NICHOLSON, WSBA #30499  
18                               711 Capitol Way S., Suite 602  
19                               Olympia, WA 98501  
20                               (360) 534-9960  
21                               [John@ssslawgroup.com](mailto:John@ssslawgroup.com)  
22                               Special Assistant Attorney General  
23                               Attorney for Answering Defendants  
24  
25  
26

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I certify that on March 14, 2025 I electronically filed the foregoing with the Court through CM/ECF and served on all parties or their counsel of record a copy of this document addressed as follows:

Robert Bouvatte P.O. Box 14185 Tumwater, WA 98511 <a href="mailto:bob@rbouvattepllc.com">bob@rbouvattepllc.com</a> Attorney for Plaintiff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CM/ECF-Filing <input type="checkbox"/> ABC/Legal Messenger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
David Pivtorak The Pivtorak Law Firm 611 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 911 Los Angeles, CA 90017 <a href="mailto:david@piv4law.com">david@piv4law.com</a> Attorney for Plaintiff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CM/ECF-Filing <input type="checkbox"/> ABC/Legal Messenger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Chad E. Arceneaux Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Torts Division 1250 Pacific Ave., Suite 105 Tacoma, WA 98401 <a href="mailto:Chad.arceneaux@atg.wa.gov">Chad.arceneaux@atg.wa.gov</a> Attorney for Defendants Ayotte and Brooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CM/ECF-Filing <input type="checkbox"/> ABC/Legal Messenger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2025 at Olympia, WA.

/s/ Jenny Singleton

Jenny Singleton, Paralegal  
711 Capitol Way S, Ste 602  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Tel: (360) 534-9960  
jenny@ssslawgroup.com

ANSWER TO [CORRECTED] SECOND  
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
DAMAGES BY DEFENDANTS STATE,  
SIMONS, WILLIAMS, AND  
WHITTEMORE – NO. 3:24-CV-06058-  
TMC – Page 11

SIMMONS SWEENEY FREIMUND SMITH TARDIF PLLC  
OLYMPIA OFFICE  
711 CAPITOL WAY S, STE 602  
OLYMPIA, WA 98501  
TEL: (360) 534-9960  
FAX: (360) 534-9959  
EMAIL: john@ssslawgroup.com

BELLINGHAM OFFICE  
1223 COMMERCIAL ST  
BELLINGHAM, WA 98225  
TEL: (360) 752-2000  
FAX: (360) 656-5013